#### REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

### **Claim Amendments**

Claims 1, 4 and 14 have been amended to delete the non-elected subject matter, i.e., the ring formed by R and W together. Accordingly, the objection to claim 14 should be withdrawn.

No new matter has been added to this application by these amendments.

## Consideration After Final Rejection

Although this amendment is presented after final rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments and consider the remarks, as they clearly place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants note that the amendments merely delete the non-elected subject matter, as suggested by the Examiner.

#### **Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 and 10-12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of co-pending Application No. 10/517,847.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner hold the above rejection in abeyance, pending an indication that the claims are otherwise allowable.

Furthermore, referring to MPEP 804 (I)(B), a "provisional" double patenting rejection should continue to be made by the Examiner in each application as long as there are conflicting claims in more than one application <u>unless that "provisional" double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in at least one of the applications</u>.

Attorney Docket No. 2004\_1927A Serial No. 10/517,633 March 14, 2008

In this case, there are no other outstanding rejections, and accordingly, the provisional double patenting rejection should be withdrawn, and the application allowed to issue. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the provisional double patenting rejection.

# **Conclusion**

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the grounds of objection and rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Keiji KAMIYAMA et al.

Amy E. Schmid

Registration No. 55,965 Attorney for Applicants

AES/nrj Washington, D.C. 20006-1021 Telephone (202) 721-8200 Facsimile (202) 721-8250 March 14, 2008